

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 B&G Foods North America,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 Kim Embry and Environmental Health
15 Advocates, Inc., acting as enforcement
16 representatives under California Proposition 65
on behalf of the State of California,

17 Defendants.

No. 2:20-cv-00526-KJM-DB

18 B&G Foods North America,

19 Plaintiffs,

20 v.

21 Kim Embry and Environmental Health
22 Advocates, Inc., acting as enforcement
23 representatives under California Proposition 65
on behalf of the State of California,

24 Defendants.
25

No. 2:24-cv-01396-DAD-DB

RELATED CASE ORDER

26 Examination of the above-captioned actions reveals that they are related within the
27 meaning of the Local Rules. “[B]oth actions involve similar questions of fact and the same
28 question of law and their assignment to the same Judge or Magistrate Judge is likely to effect a

1 substantial savings of judicial effort.” Local Rule 123(a)(3). The assignment of these matters to
2 the same judge is likely to effect a substantial savings of judicial effort and is likely to be
3 convenient for the parties.

4 The parties should be aware that relating cases under Rule 123 causes the actions to be
5 assigned to the same judge—it does not consolidate the actions. Under Rule 123, related cases
6 are generally assigned to the judge and magistrate judge to whom the first filed action was
7 assigned.

8 As a result, it is hereby ORDERED that

- 9 • Case No. 2:24-cv-01396-DAD-DB is reassigned from District Judge Drozd to the
10 undersigned.

11 The caption on documents filed in the reassigned case shall show Case No. 2:20-cv-
12 00526-KJM-DB.

13 It is further ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court make appropriate adjustment in the
14 assignment of civil cases to compensate for this reassignment.

15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 DATED: May 20, 2024.

17 
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE